

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL



110 Sherman Street
Hartford, CT 06105

(860) 808-5540 (PHONE)
(860) 808-5585 (FAX)

Office of the Attorney General
State of Connecticut

TELEFAX COMMUNICATION

Date:

1/2/02

To:

Rensata Hesse

202 307 1454

Telefax #:

Number of Pages:
(including this)

2

From:

Rachel Davis

Information
faxed by:

COMMENTS:

NOTICE: This telecopy transmission and any accompanying documents may contain confidential or privileged information. They are intended only for use by the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, copy, distribute or use in any manner the contents of this information. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange retrieval of the faxed documents.

Douglas B. Schaper
310 East 44th Street; #1509
NYC, NY 10017

Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly
C/O Attorney General Richard Blumenthal
MacKenzie Hall
110 Sherman Street
Hartford, CT 06105-2294

FYI -
AG Blumenthal

12.13.01

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

My introduction to computer software came in the winter of 1973 when I narrated a media presentation for BASIC computer language.

Since that time I have used many softwares for many purposes personal and professional, some commercial, some proprietary.

I am writing you this letter to decry the recent agreement between the DOJ and Microsoft, and in support of the actions of the nine states before you.

President Kennedy, in 1961, proposed that we land on the moon with our science. Eight years later we achieved that goal.

By way of comparison, Microsoft went public in 1986 - fifteen years ago, and software is still in the dark ages. Every single day that I use Microsoft product I curse its inefficiencies.

I recently asked a computer salesman at J&R Computers in NYC about an alternative to Microsoft product. He looked at me like I was sprouting wings and new heads on the moment.

I worked in venture capital for a company in New York City - there are no funds for competition to Microsoft product. This says a lot about a lax regulatory environment reinforcing competition to Microsoft product - a situation these nine states are attempting to address. It also says a lot - particularly in light of our moon exploration - about Microsoft's pursuit of "quality" product.

Microsoft has not pursued quality product - at least not from the standpoint of the consumer. Quality to Microsoft has meant quality of its control over the marketplace, which until this opportunity to open it up has been absolute - all because of one sale to IBM and the company's ensuing determination, successful until now (we hope), to maintain control over that marketplace.

Look around you. What alternative to Microsoft is there? Standardizing product, in light of 110 volt electricity for the home, 220 for heavy machinery, 12 volts for the car, 3/8 inch pipe for plumbing, #2 pencils, size 8s for women and so many other examples in manufacturing, design and service, comes out of pressure from the consumer and the marketplace - not from one company exercising control over that marketplace and any competition.

Microsoft product is an abomination in terms of its quality for the consumer, and since there is no real alternative to it there can be no argument about that fact or the control - from somewhere - of both the product and the market. You must know that if we had a competitive marketplace arena for software, Microsoft product would be much better and there would be alternatives to it. The company's primary focus has been not on quality - but on control. And in this, and in this alone, it has been successful.

I deeply, nay - more than deeply, hope you will help everyone - including Microsoft - by ruling in favor of these nine states. I am desperate for better software - we ALL are.

DBS